DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 431 250 EC 307 228

AUTHOR	Botterbusch, Karl F.; Miller, John W.
TITLE	A Survey of Community-Based Rehabilitation Programs: Goals, Outcomes, Consumers, Finances, and Changes.
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin Univ.-Stout, Menomonie. Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Inst.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1999-03-00
NOTE	72p.
CONTRACT	H133B30088
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adults; *Community Programs; Delivery Systems; *Disabilities; Financial Support; *Institutional Characteristics; Outcomes of Treatment; *Program Costs; *Program Design; *Rehabilitation Programs; Services; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

This report discusses the outcomes of a study that examined the present state of 124 community-based rehabilitation programs (CRP) and future trends. Results indicated: (1) the typical CRP served an average of 219 consumers daily and had total revenues of $5.262 million; (2) more than 60 percent of the CRPs offered programs in the following areas: supported employment, sheltered employment programs, job skills and work adjustment programs, and vocational education and assessment; (3) almost 60 percent offered placement programs; (4) facilities pursue general goals to enable consumers to achieve competitive employment, and specific goals related to services and programs; (5) the most common outcomes were supported employment, competitive employment, and earning enough to be self-supporting; (6) all facilities served persons with disabilities and most served persons with either severe or multiple disabilities; (7) most revenues come from public fees for consumer services, such as state vocational rehabilitation, developmental disabilities, and mental health sources; (8) fees for services covered a mean percentage of 76 percent of the cost of providing services; and (9) slightly over half of the sample believed that expected changes in funding would affect the operations and provision of services in a negative way. (Contains 17 references.) (CR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 431 250

A Survey of Community-Based Rehabilitation Programs: Goals, Outcomes, Consumers, Finances, and Changes

Karl F. Botterbusch, Ph.D.
John W. Miller, BS

Research and Training Center
Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute
University of Wisconsin-Stout
Menomonie, Wisconsin 54751

EC 307228

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Survey of Community-Based Rehabilitation Programs: Goals, Outcomes, Consumers, Finances, and Changes

Karl F. Botterbusch, Ph.D.
John W. Miller, BS

Research and Training Center
Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute
University of Wisconsin-Stout
Menomonie, Wisconsin 54751

Research and Training Center Staff

Frederick E. Menz, Research Director
Jean Davis, Clerical

March, 1999

The contents of this document were developed under a grant (#H133B30088) from the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR), U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC. The opinions expressed do not necessarily represent those of NIDRR or the U.S. Department of Education.

Copyright © 1999

Research and Training Center
Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute
College of Human Development
University of Wisconsin-Stout
Menomonie, Wisconsin 54751

Executive Summary

Community-based rehabilitation programs (CRPs) provide a wide variety of vocational rehabilitation and related services to persons with disabilities and persons who are economically disadvantaged. This study is the latest in a series of survey research by the Center to describe the current state of CRPs and to predict future trends. As indicated in the literature review, facilities have changed considerably over the past 15 years with the rate of change increasing over the past few years. This study has two purposes:

1. To describe the present state of community-based rehabilitation programs.

2. To determine future trends.

Following a review of relevant literature and input from a select Constituency Advisory Committee, it was decided to include the following five topics: goals, outcomes, demographic characteristics of consumers, revenue and expenditures, and the anticipated effects of funding changes. Two questionnaires were mailed at different times to national stratified random samples of community-based rehabilitation programs in the fall of 1997. A total of 124 useable surveys were returned. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and factor analyses. The key results were as follows:

1. **CRP characteristics**. In 1996, the "typical" CRP served an average of 219 consumers daily and had total revenues of $5.262 million. Facilities varied greatly in size and revenues. Over 60 percent of the CRPs offered programs in the following areas: supported employment, sheltered employment programs, job skills and work adjustment programs, and vocational evaluation and assessment. Almost 60 percent offered placement programs.

2. **Goals**. Facilities pursue general and specific vocational goals. General goals to improve quality of life and enable consumers to achieve competitive employment are widely accepted by most CRPs. Specific goals relate more to specific services and programs and are most commonly (a) to provide job skills training, (b) to provide employment of persons with disabilities, and (c) to provide specific vocational services. In addition to serving consumer and referral source needs, CRPs are beginning to identify employer needs as a program goal.

3. **Outcomes**. The most common outcomes were *supported employment, competitive employment*, and *earnings enough to be self-supporting*. Most CRPs reported achieving these desired outcomes between 1 and 40 percent of the time, indicating modest to fair success. There were no significant differences between outcomes for 1996 and 1999; this indicated that no major changes are anticipated.

4. **Populations**. All facilities served persons with disabilities and most served persons with either severe or multiple disabilities. Persons with disabilities are expected to continue to be the present and future focus for CRP services and programs. Increases in welfare recipients and school-to-work transition populations are expected by about half of the sample; these are emerging populations. The percent of consumers served who are

women, ethnic minorities, senior citizens, from inner cities, and from rural areas are expected to increase. These changes will result in a considerable consumer diversity in most rehabilitation organizations.

5. **Revenues and expenditures**. CRPs have a wide range of revenue and expenditures. In terms of overall revenue and expenditures, they range from small businesses to organizations with yearly revenues of over $40 million. Within this range, however, most revenues come from public fees for consumer services. The three most common sources of these fees are state vocational rehabilitation, developmental disabilities, and mental health. These are expected to continue for the near future. Emerging sources of fees are from welfare, schools, and individuals and families. Business activity income is not nearly as an important revenue source as are fees for services.

6. **Proportion of costs covered**. Fees for services covered a mean percentage of 76 percent of the cost of providing services. For 1999, these fees were expected to cover the same percentage of service costs. The remaining 25 percent comes from other sources, most often from business income.

7. **Impacts of changes in funding**. Slightly over half the sample believed that expected changes in funding would affect the operations and provision of services in a negative way in cost to provide services, agency overhead costs, total consumers served, persons served with severe disabilities, staff turnover, and attention to consumer concerns.

Conclusions. Presently, in terms of consumer size and total revenues, there are no "typical" CRPs. Because of these two factors and the communities in which they operate, CRPs vary greatly. In comparing the results of these surveys with earlier Center surveys on facilities, it appears that the average CRP has increased in size and the number of CRPs has declined. This indicates a trend for CRPs to either become larger or to go out of business. In looking for common features in CRPs, one needs to move beyond funding amounts and size. Facilities share common goals of providing vocational services to persons with disabilities and others. Most of the services offered center on supported employment, competitive employment, vocational training, and noncompetitive employment. In achieving these common service goals, CRPs experience success with less than 40 percent of the consumers served. While this 40 percent figure may appear low, it roughly agrees with many of the current outcome studies. Finally, all CRPs serve mainly persons with disabilities and receive the majority of their revenues from public sources of fees for services.

Future changes in CRPs will differ from present conditions mostly in degree. The number of persons with severe and multiple disabilities are expected to increase. Services are expected to remain about the same and funding levels are not expected to keep pace with need or cost of providing services. Increased services will be provided to welfare recipients and youth moving from school to work. The number of minorities, women (most likely related to welfare reform), senior citizens, persons from inner city, and persons from rural areas will also increase.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary iii

Table of Contents v

List of Tables vi

Chapter I Introduction 1

Chapter II Literature Review 3
Consumers Served by Community-based Rehabilitation Programs 3
Characteristics of Community-based Rehabilitation Programs 4

Chapter III Method 7
Involvement of Constituency Advisory Committee 7
Procedures 7
Data Collection 9
Data Handling and Analysis 10

Chapter IV Results 13
Comparison of Responses From the Two Mailings 13
Organizational Goals 13
Customer Service Outcomes for 1996 and 1999 19
Service Populations 22
Revenues and Expenditures 24
Anticipated Impact of Funding Changes 31

Chapter V Discussion 35
Number of CRPs and Overall Size 35
Goals and Outcomes 35
Populations Served 36
Revenues, Expenditures, and Revenue Sources 36
Changes in Funding 37
Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations 38

References 41

Appendices 43
Appendix A: Organizational Profile - First Survey 45
Appendix B: Organizational Profile - Second Survey 51

List of Tables

Table 1.	Differences Between First and Second Surveys	8
Table 2.	Sampling Design for Survey	9
Table 3.	Rate of Return for Mailings 1 and 2	10
Table 4.	Comparison of Responses From Mailings 1 and 2 on Key Program Variables	14
Table 5.	Comparison of Responses From Mailings 1 and 2 on Size, Federal Region, and Programs Offered	15
Table 6.	Importance of Organizational Goals in Percent (N = 124)	16
Table 7.	Factor Analysis of Organizational Goals	18
Table 8.	Consumer Outcomes for 1996 and Estimated for 1999 With Chi Squares Between Years (N = 108)	20
Table 9.	Factor Analysis of Facility Outcomes for 1996	21
Table 10.	Service Populations: 1996 Percent Served and Mean Number Served and 1999 Estimated Change (N = 106)	23
Table 11.	Revenues by Major Sources in Dollars for 1996 and Estimated Changes for 1999 (N = 82)	25
Table 12.	Expenditures by Cost Centers in Dollars for 1996 and Estimated Changes for 1999 (N = 56)	25
Table 13.	Ratio of Assets to Liabilities for 1996 and 1999	26
Table 14.	Proportion of Revenue From Fees Paid for Services by State and County Public Funds (N = 90)	27
Table 15.	Proportion of Total Revenue Obtained From Fees From Specific Funding Sources in 1996 and Estimated Changes for 1999 (N = 48)	28
Table 16.	Primary Sources of Business Activity Income for 1996 and Estimated Changes for 1999 (N = 76)	30
Table 17.	Proportions of Program Costs Covered and Percent of Estimated Overhead (N = 75)	30
Table 18.	Possible Areas Impacted by Changes in Funding (N = 65)	32
Table 19.	Factor Analysis of Possible Areas of Impact Due to Changes in Funding	33

Chapter 1

Introduction

Community-based rehabilitation programs (CRPs) provide a wide variety of vocational rehabilitation and related services to persons with disabilities and persons who are economically disadvantaged. These mostly private nonprofit organizations offer training, employment, support, and independent living services to numerous funding sources such as state vocational rehabilitation (VR), mental health, and developmental disabilities. Because CRPs provide significant direct services to many persons with disabilities and other conditions, the importance of CRPs cannot be doubted. CRPs reflect the communities they serve and vary greatly in size and funding levels.

Although change has always been a part of the history of facilities, the rate of change has increased over the past few years for the following reasons. First, various types of supported employment have become the employment method of choice. Second, order of selection and other vocational rehabilitation mandates have focused services on persons with severe disabilities. Third, some funding streams have shifted from federal to state and local sources. Fourth, the generally low unemployment rates over the past five years have resulted in an increased need for new workers in many occupational areas. Fifth, welfare reform is influencing the type of consumers served by CRPs. Sixth, closely related to welfare reform are major changes in U. S. Department of Labor workforce policies and related funding. Seventh, CRPs are experimenting with a variety of business activities that are far removed from traditional sheltered employment.

We lack information to measure the type and degree of these possible changes. Therefore, the first purpose of this study is to accurately describe the present state of CRPs. The second purpose is to estimate near-future trends as seen by the respondents. This will permit us to describe what the CRPs are expected to look like in the near future. More importantly, it will permit us to estimate what changes are expected to occur between two time periods.

Chapter II

Literature Review

This brief review describes both the consumers and rehabilitation organizations as suggested from studies conducted by the Center over the past 12 years. The results of this prior research were used to design the present study.

Consumers Served by Community-based Rehabilitation Programs

Cyzerlinsky and Gilbertson (1985) surveyed CARF accredited organizations and obtained data in the three broad areas of consumer characteristics, referral sources, and organizational characteristics. The three primary disabilities that accounted for over 75 percent of the consumers were mental retardation (51%), psychiatric disability (22%)[1], and cerebral palsy (6%). The three major sources of funding were state vocational rehabilitation (52%), mental retardation/developmental disability (8%), and mental health (7%). Male consumers comprised 56 percent of the population; over three-fourths were white, and 80 percent were under age 40. Most consumers had not completed formal job training. Small facilities served a wider variety of disabilities than median and larger organizations, and the typical consumer was a "mentally retarded white male in the age range of 25-40 with less than a high school education" (p. vi).

A 1989 survey of facilities found that 55 percent had mental retardation/developmental disability, 28 percent had mental illness or a related psycho-social disability, 20 percent had multiple disabilities, and 7 percent had physical disabilities (Menz, 1990). The four major sources of funding were VR (31%), MR/DD (32%), other (19%), and mental health (14%). Slightly under 80 percent were white and over sixty percent were in early or mid-career.

When comparing these two studies, several points need to be made. First, the two most common disability groups were MR/DD and psychiatric disability. In both studies, mental retardation was the disability of about half the consumers; mental illness was the disability of over 20 percent of the sample. While this accounts for about 70 percent of the samples, there was some confusion with the remaining 30 percent of the consumers. The 1990 survey listed 20 percent as having "multiple disabilities;" there was no such category for the 1985 survey. Some of this confusion may be attributed to the addition of the "multiple disabilities" category in the 1989 survey; during this time period increased emphasis was being placed on serving persons with severe disabilities. The second consideration is funding sources. Between 1985 and 1989, the proportion of funds from VR declined by 20 percent, while the amount from MR/DD and mental health increased considerably. In the 1989 study, "other" funding was listed at 19 percent. Because most MR/DD and mental health funds are state or local and much of the "other" funds could have been local, there was a major shift in funding from the federal, through the VR system, to state and local funding. Third, it appears that older persons and, especially, ethnic minorities were underserved.

Historically, the consumer populations served by CRPs have been predominantly white, had good work histories, were of working age, and had physical or cognitive disabilities (Menz, 1985, 1998). A 1993 report to the Chairperson of the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Select

[1]Combines mental illness (15%) and emotional disturbance (7%).

Education and Civil Rights reported that about 58 percent of VR applicants for disability services were men. About 20 percent of consumers were African American, and 5 percent were of Hispanic origin (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1993). Most consumers were under the age of 45, with a quarter in the 18 to 24 age range and about half in the 24 to 44 age range. Over the past several years, the percentage of persons' age categories has shifted. Consumer populations now include more younger persons with limited work experience, or persons at the upper end of their employment years. In other words, while working-age adults still form the bulk of CRP consumers, younger and older persons are increasing (Menz, 1993, 1994, 1998).

Reports to the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) indicated that case closures for individuals with severe disabilities increased from 51 percent of all case closures in 1988 to 66 percent of case closures in 1995 (Whitney-Thomas, Timmons, Thomas, Gilmore, & Fesko, 1997). Also, changes in the racial and ethnic backgrounds of clients have dramatically shifted over the years, along with an increase in the age of those applying for VR service (Giordano & D'Alonzo, 1995). In 1988, Caucasians made up 78.3 percent of the client population. In 1995, that percentage dropped to 76.9 percent while there were notable increases in clients from the African American, Native American, Asia/Pacific Islander, and Hispanic populations (Whitney-Thomas, et al, 1997). Another change has been an increase in the female client population. Severe disabilities among females has been reported at 11 percent, while severe disability rates among males is around 8 percent (McNeil, 1993; NCD, 1996).

Characteristics of Community-based Rehabilitation Programs

It appears that most vocational rehabilitation services are provided in CRPs. At present there are over 7,000 organizations which differ in size, location, programs, philosophy, and desired outcomes. Prior to the present study, the Center conducted two recent, major studies that focused on CRP characteristics. Czerlinsky and Gilbertson (1985) found that the average facility served 387 persons per year and that consumers averaged 151.8 days of service by the organization. At the time of the survey, the average yearly facility income was $768,988 per year with fees for services and earned income accounting for about 90 percent of total revenues. The average organization employed about 35 persons, the largest number of whom provided direct services or were production supervisors. The majority of facilities provided vocational programs in vocational evaluation, work adjustment, sheltered employment, and job placement. While they varied in size, the average facility was fairly small, derived income from fees and production, and provided common vocational services.

The second study by Menz in 1989 obtained information from a national sample of facilities. Between 1980 and 1989, the number of CRPs were estimated to have increased from 5,500 to 7,000 (Menz, 1990). The mean annual budget, adjusted for inflation, had risen to $1.393 million. Each facility served an average of 336 consumers per year. As in the 1985 study, the majority of income came from either fees or production and indicated

> . . . evaluation, training, and employment remain the mainstream services for rehabilitation facilities, with substantial portions of those provided in facility-controlled settings. ...Employment and work experience is more likely to take place in facility settings, with sheltered employment being much more likely than work

activities. Employment in community-based settings is equally likely to be under individualized or group methods. (p. II-44)

This same survey also reported changes in funding by organizational size. Median and large size organizations reported between 10 and 15 percent decreases in fees for services; 50 percent of facilities classified as small or small-median increased their reliance on fees for rehabilitation services. Finally, organizational size, as measured by number of consumers served annually, increased (Menz,1990).

These two studies indicated three major trends. First, the number of facilities or CRPs increased. Second, while the mean number of consumers served per year declined slightly, CRP annual budgets increased considerably. This was most likely due to the increasing emphasis and associated costs to provide services to consumers with severe disabilities. Third, by 1989 facilities were beginning to provide more services in the community as they changed from a "facilities orientation" to "community-based rehabilitation programs."

In 1995, the Center conducted a pilot study designed to determine organization financial support, types of services provided, and the effect of Social Security Disability Insurance and Supplemental Security Income on consumer participation (Johnson, Botterbusch, & Menz, 1996). Because of small sample sizes and a lack of experimental rigor, this study did not provide sufficient data to accurately measure relative income derived from various funding sources. Based on semistructured interviews with 20 community-based service providers, it was found that

> (a) Almost half of an organization's budget was earned through subcontracts, prime manufacturing, and sales; (b) county social services provided another 22.30 percent of the budget; (c) in combination, about 70 percent of the organizations' budget were derived from purely local sources (i.e., contracts and sales, social services); (d) rehabilitation organizations have their roots firmly planted in their county(ies); and (e) programs had little or no unique funding sources. (p. *iii*)

Others have observed that a continuing problem is offering adequate services with severe funding restrictions. A quote from Gray and Gilbert (1992) summarized this problem, "Rehabilitation facilities report that they are serving more difficult clients without adequate compensation."

The perception of who is the CRP's customer has shifted from referral source to consumer, and from consumer to employer (Bestgen, 1992). Present emphasis is on employer needs and services. The next emphasis will be the community (Menz, McAlees, Thomas, Coker, & Flynn, 1997). This is partially based on increased local funding and, hence, local control is a result of the ongoing shift in government and financial resources. Rehabilitation facilities need to be perceived as an industry, not a charity; as services in the community, not as a building where things happen; and employment and community integration are outcomes, not as a way to protect and occupy persons with disabilities (Shaw, 1992; Menz, 1990).

As the largest group of direct service providers for persons with disabilities, CRPs are a significant industry that needs to be systematically studied. Based on the literature review, the

following areas need continuing research:

1. The disability, ethnic, and demographic characteristics of the consumers.
2. CRP changes in income, fee sources, and expenditures.
3. CRP changes in services as related to changes in funding levels.

Chapter III

Method

This section describes the establishment of a Constituency Advisory Committee (CAC), the development of data collection instruments, the selection of samples, data collection, data entry, and data transformation and analysis. The parameters of the study were developed from conclusions from the literature review, the advice of the CAC, and Center staff knowledge of facilities and their needs.

Involvement of Constituency Advisory Committee

A national Constituency Advisory Committee (CAC) consisting of the following members was established to guide all phases of the study:

Gary Cook, President and CEO Occupational Center of Central Kansas, Inc. Salina, Kansas	Janet Samuelson, President Fairfax Opportunities Unlimited Alexandria Virginia
John Miller, President Goodwill Industries of Southeastern Wisconsin, Inc. Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Robert Stuva, Executive Director Rehabilitation for Wisconsin, Inc. Madison, Wisconsin
Richard Oestreich, President and CEO Vocational Guidance Services Cleveland, Ohio	

CAC members contributed in the following ways: (a) reviewed the scope of this study and the research questions to determine if they were relevant; (b) reviewed the data collection instruments for changes and suggestions, either in format or content; (c) advised on a sampling plan; (d) provided assistance in obtaining endorsements for the study; and (e) provided ideas for data analysis.

Procedures

Instrumentation. The basic content of the survey instrument was developed from the three research needs (i.e., consumer characteristics, finances, and services) identified in the literature review and from two additional topics identified by the CAC and Center staff: (a) Organizational goals included the stated purposes for the organization's existence, and (b) because the general purpose of CRPs is to provide vocational and related services that result in tangible results, desired consumer outcomes were included. Items for each of these five areas were developed from prior Center research, current and anticipated future issues of the field of vocational rehabilitation, and staff and CAC expertise. The initial draft of the questionnaire was revised numerous times before staff and CAC members were satisfied with both content and format. Over the course of the study, two separate instruments were developed and used.

First instrument. The initial instrument was designed to measure trends across three time periods: 1994, 1996, and (projected) 1999 (Appendix A). CRPs were asked to provide a variety of

outcomes, consumer demographics, and financial information from annual reports or other sources for 1994 and 1996. They were also asked to project much of this information to 1999. This first instrument was mailed to a sample in September, 1997. Based on the low rate of return and communications from CRP staff in the sample, it was determined that the first survey took too much time to be completed.

Second instrument. In order to obtain a larger sample of CRPs, it was decided to simplify the first instrument and to make changes so that these two instruments could be combined for data analysis. All items requesting information for 1994 were excluded and in some of the 1999 items, items asking specific numbers were replaced with three-point rating scales in increase, no change, and decrease. Table 1 presents a summary of the changes between these two instruments.

Table 1. Differences Between First and Second Surveys

Content Category	First Instrument	Second Instrument
Vocational Programs Offered	List of 6 common programs; space for additional programs.	No changes.
Goals	19 items. Listed, rate (0 to 5) in importance.	No changes.
Consumer Outcomes	10 items. 1994, 1996 and 1999 asked for proportions achieving each goal.	10 items. 1996 and 1999 proportion achieving each goal. 1996 response format changed.
Consumers Served	20 items. Counts for total consumers. 1994, 1996, and 1999 number of consumers in each category.	20 items. Counts for total consumers. 1996 number of consumers in each category. 1999 anticipated increase, no change, or decrease.
Revenue and Expenses	36 items. Report actual dollar amounts for 1994 and 1996 and estimated dollar amounts for 1999.	36 items. Actual dollar amounts for 1996. 1999 anticipated increase, no change, or decrease.
Changes in Funding	1 general item. 20 specific items. Each rated increased, no impact, or decreased. 5 short written response items.	No changes.

Sampling design. A stratified random sample was selected from the RTC's national mailing list of CRPs. As seen on Table 2, a 20 percent sample stratified by federal region was selected (Column B). A 30 percent rate of return was estimated (Column C). In order to permit a separate analysis of each region's CRPs, the sample sizes of regions with under 50 CRPs in the sample were deliberately over sampled (Column E). The final sample sizes were presented in Column F.

Table 2. Sampling Design for Survey

Federal Region	(A) Number of Sites on RTC Mailing List	(B) Initial 20% Sample Size	(C) Assume a 30% Rate of Return	(D) Over Sample to Obtain n=50 in Each Cell	(E) Estimated n to Add to Initial Sample to Obtain Cell n = 50	(F) Final Sample Size
I. Boston	530	106	32	18	60	166
II. New York	535	107	32	18	60	167
III. Philadelphia	824	165	50	n/a	n/a	165
IV. Atlanta	851	170	51	n/a	n/a	170
V. Chicago	1627	326	98	n/a	n/a	326
VI. Dallas	531	107	32	18	60	167
VII. Kansas City	374	75	23	27	89	164
VIII. Denver	196	40	12	38	125	165 ① *(98)*
IX. San Francisco	643	129	39	11	37	166
X. Seattle	254	51	15	35	115	166 ① *(127)*
Total:	6365	1276	384	165	546	1822

Column B = Column A x .20 .
Column C = Column B x .30.
Column D = 50 - Column C.
Column E = Column C x 3.3 (where 3.3 = approximate ratio of Column C to Column B).
Column F = Column E + Column B.
① *Oversample — Sample size is over 50% of number of organizations for this region. Cut to 50% of region.*

Notes: For an estimated population 6,000 a sample of 938 is accurate to + or - 3%.
Assume a 30% rate of return. This gives a sample of 384, accurate to + or - 5% for the sample as a whole.

Data Collection

In an attempt to increase the number of valid responses, national and state CRP trade and professional organizations were asked to inform their members of the survey and ask for their cooperation in completing the survey. These organizations were contacted about six weeks prior to the mailing of the first survey. National and state organizations responded by including information about the study in newsletters, correspondence, and e-mailing their members.

As indicated on Table 3, two separate surveys were mailed in late September and in early December, 1997. Surveys, letters of explanation, and program definitions (Appendix A) were mailed to all CRPs. Of the 1,700 surveys mailed in September, over 200 were returned by the postal service as undeliverable and for which no alternate mailing address could be located. This implied

that these 200 organizations had gone out of business or had merged with other organizations. The revised survey was mailed to 1,400 organizations in December, 1997. A total of 124 returns were obtained with the final sample consisting of 34 returns from the first survey and 90 from the second survey. Rates of return were 2.0 percent and 6.4 percent, respectively.

Table 3. Rate of Return for Mailings 1 and 2

Event	Survey	
	First Survey (Sample 1)	Second Survey (Sample 2)
Number selected for sample	1700	1400
Mailing dates		
Mailing	September 26,1997	December 12, 1997
Cut-off dates	November 30, 1997	January 16, 1998
Number returned and rate of return		
Valid number returned	34	90
Rate of return	2.0 %	6.4 %
Percentage of final sample	27.0 %	71.4 %

Data Handling and Analysis

All returned surveys were reviewed for internal consistency and missing data. Items asking for specific funding sources were the most common source of missing data. The 124 surveys were entered into an SPSS database. Data from both surveys were combined and data for the years 1996 and 1999 were analyzed. Because of the very large amount of missing data, the 1994 data from the first survey were not analyzed.

Data recoding to optimize responses. There were two problems in data analysis. The first was missing data and the number of valid cases for each section of the survey. For each section except Goals, surveys were returned with missing responses for the entire section. The following corrections were made:

Goals. All 124 respondents completed this section. Missing data and 0 (*Not your goal*) were combined into one *Not a goal* category. The assumption was that persons not responding to a particular goal item were indicating that this item did not represent a goal to that responding CRP.

Consumer outcomes. The 16 respondents who failed to respond to any consumer outcomes items were not included in the data analysis for this section. As with Goals above, missing data and 0 *(Not an outcome)* responses were added to produce a new *Not an outcome* category.

Counts of consumers served. Number and percent of persons with various characteristics

served were calculated from the number of CRPs who listed their estimated annual total of consumers served and indicated that they served persons with disabilities. One-hundred and six CRPs met this selection criteria. For all variables requiring the entry of a specific number (e.g., *Number of immigrants served*), a missing response and a zero, indicating no persons with a specific characteristic served was an acceptable response.

Total revenue and total expenditures. In this series of items, respondents were asked to enter the total revenues and expenditures and then to record the revenues for several more specific categories. Two steps were used to ensure consistent data. First, all CRPs not listing total revenues or total expenditures were not included. Second, the amounts in these specific categories were added to obtain calculated totals for revenues and expenses. The total from addition and the total entered were compared for each CRP. If the total revenue or expenses listed was within 20 percent of the calculated revenue or expenditures, the case was selected.

Revenue sources. Useable and consistent responses were obtained separately from each of the three revenue sources categories (i.e., fees from public services, fees from specific services and other sources, and business activity income) using the methods described immediately above.

Areas impacted. CRPs were first asked if their organization "detected significant impacts as a result of changes or shifts in funding." The 65 positive responses to this item were used to calculate the percentages for each of the possible areas impacted.

The second data analysis problem centered on outliers. Each distribution was examined and the outliers were removed through a process of recoding outliers as the next highest or lowest value in the distribution. Because it retained all observations in each distribution, no data were lost. In comparing several distributions with and without recoding of outliers, it was observed that the means commonly changed by less than two percent. Standard deviations, of course, were somewhat reduced in value.

Data analysis. After the above changes were made in the data, data analysis was begun. First, responses between the two mailings were compared using t-tests to determine if the two samples could be combined. The most common analyses were descriptive statistics for the interval level data, frequencies for nominal data, and factor analysis using a principal components analysis with varimax rotation (SPSS, Inc., 1988). Because of the small sample size, data were not analyzed by any classification variables.

Chapter IV

Results

This section reports the results for all survey items and sections. It begins by comparing samples 1 and 2 to determine if they were drawn from the same population. Because only one significant difference was found between the two samples, they were combined into one sample. The remainder of this section presents the combined data for the two surveys. The organization of this Results Section follows the outline of the surveys, goals, outcomes, types of consumers served, revenues and expenses, and areas impacted by funding changes.

Comparison of Responses from the Two Mailings

As indicated on Table 3, the two mailings returned 124 surveys for an 8.4 rate of return. Prior to other data analysis, the two surveys were compared to determine if they came from the same population. Data on Table 4 compared the two samples on continuous variables. The two samples did not significantly differ in terms of number of consumers served, persons with disabilities served, and overall financial indicators. *Average daily number of consumers served* was barely significant at the .05 level. The reader will note that for all means (except the number of vocational programs) the standard deviations are larger than the means. This characteristic, found in most frequency distributions reported in this report, reflects the amount of variety found in CRPs.

Data in Table 5 compares mailings in CRP size in Quartiles, combined federal regions, and number of programs offered. The median number of consumers served by each facility was 225 per year. The ten Federal regions were combined into five regions for data analysis. As indicated by the percentage of returns from these regions, the surveys were fairly representative of the entire U.S. There were no significant differences between the two mailings on CRP size and geographical region. The two mailings differed significantly on the proportion having supported employment and competitive placement programs. Less than half of the CRPs provided programs in transitional employment and vocational evaluation. Over 80 percent had both supported employment and sheltered programs, an indication that CRPs are providing a wide variety of employment options for consumers.

Organizational Goals

Table 6 presents the percentages of responses to the 18 organizational goals; these are rank ordered in descending importance based on the percent of responses to the "Core" goal alternative. The two most important core goals for the organizations in the study were the general goals of *Improve quality of life of persons with disabilities* (82.3%) and *Enable consumers to achieve their vocational goals* (64.5%). The next group of goals tended to represent more specific activities: *Provide employment to persons with disabilities* (58.9%), *Provide specific vocational rehabilitation services* (52.4%), and *Enable consumers to achieve competitive employment* (50.8%).

Table 4. Comparison of Responses From Mailings 1 and 2 on Key Program Variables

Community Rehabilitation Program Characteristics for 1996	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	t-Test between Samples 1 and 2		
					Value	df	p
Total consumers served per year							
Mailing 1	31	584.71	192.00	1020.66			
Mailing 2	80	659.96	235.00	1116.35	.410	109	.683
Combined Mailing	111	652.86	230.00	1086.71			
Average daily number of consumers served							
Mailing 1	26	117.92	67.50	123.97	1.982	99	.050
Mailing 2	75	256.81	131.00	348.81			
Combined Mailing	101	221.06	110.00	312.41			
Number of new consumers per year	30	264.07	61.50	417.19			
Mailing 1	72	192.17	50.00	369.16	.862	100	.391
Mailing 2	102	213.31	50.00	383.22			
Combined Mailing							
Number of persons with disabilities in 1996							
Mailing 1	34	364.41	117.00	451.72			
Mailing 2	90	328.58	150.50	551.41	.370	122	.712
Combined Mailing	124	338.41	131.00	451.72			
Number of vocational programs offered	29	3.51	4.00	1.70			
Mailing 1	81	4.15	4.00	1.50	1.874	108	.064
Mailing 2	110	3.98	4.00	1.57			
Combined Mailing							
Total revenues							
Mailing 1	25	4,863,972	1,501,000	10,069,653			
Mailing 2	73	7,671,290	3,721,041	11,281,592	1.102	96	.273
Combined Mailing	98	6,955,138	2,643,340	11,003,311			
Total expenditures							
Mailing 1	22	4,739,399	1,437,000	10,660,623			
Mailing 2	72	6,764,418	4,014,209	8,910,203	.890	92	.761
Combined Mailing	94	6,290,478	2,627,175	9,328,266			

Table 5. Comparisons of Responses From Mailings 1 and 2 on Size, Federal Region, and Programs Offered

Variable and categories	Frequence			Chi-square		
	Mailing 1	Mailing 2	Total	Value	df	P
Facility size based on total annual number served						
Q1 (range = 17 - 95)	10	18	28			
Q2 (range= 110 - 225)	6	22	28	1.561	3	.668
Q3 (range= 230 - 552)	8	20	28			
Q4 (range = 600 - 19,500)	7	21	28			
Total	31	81	112			
Combined federal regions (N = 124)						
Northeast	7	16	23			
South	9	13	22			
Midwest	8	23	31	4.261	4	.372
Great Plains and Rocky Mountains	7	19	26			
West	3	19	22			
Total	34	90	124			
Programs offered by responding agencies						
Vocational evaluation and/or assessment programs	21	57	78	.001	1	.975
Job skills & work adjustment programs	21	58	79	.007	1	.934
Transitional employment programs	10	34	44	.587	1	.444
Supported employment programs	18	66	84	3.936	1	.047
Competitive placement programs	14	58	72	4.824	1	.028
Employment programs (sheltered)	18	63	81	2.565	1	.109

Half the respondents listed community advocacy as a core goal. This goal was followed by four more specific vocational goals: *Provide vocational services to persons in the community* (47.6%), *Provide job skills training* (45.2%), *Provide work-ready employees to businesses* (40.3%), and *Provide long-term employment* (36.3%). The remaining goals were a combination of specific vocational goals, housing, and independent living. The only medical-orientated goal, *Provide medical and restorative services* (12.9%) was also the lowest ranked goal.

The more general goals had the highest percentage of core goal responses. In fact, those like *Improve the quality of life of persons with disabilities* and *Enable consumers to achieve their vocational goals* were more like mission statements than goals. The remaining goals often implied more specific programs. For example, *Provide job skills training* could refer to programs offering either general soft skills or hard skills in a specific occupational area, and *Provide long-term employment* strongly implies sheltered employment or affirmative industries.

Table 6. Importance of Organizational Goals in Percent (N = 124)

Program Goal	Percentage of Importance Ratings				
	Not a Goal	Not Important	Important	Most Important	Core
Improve quality of life of persons with disabilities	2.4	2.4	1.6	11.3	82.3
Enable consumers to achieve their vocational goals	7.3	.8	6.5	21.0	64.5
Provide employment to persons with disabilities	12.1	1.6	8.9	18.5	58.9
Provide specific vocational rehabilitation services	13.7	4.0	16.1	13.7	52.4
Enable consumers to achieve competitive employment	8.1	0.0	16.9	24.2	50.8
Serve as an advocate for disabled in the community	10.5	3.2	7.3	29.0	50.0
Provide vocational services to persons in the community	19.4	.8	12.1	20.2	47.6
Provide job skills training	10.5	3.2	20.2	21.0	45.2
Provide work-ready employees to businesses	13.7	2.4	25.0	18.5	40.3
Provide long-term employment	21.8	.8	16.9	24.2	36.3
Provide housing or residential services	47.6	2.4	9.7	10.5	29.8
Serve needs of community's employers	14.5	3.2	22.6	32.3	27.4
Serve as an employer in the community	21.8	7.3	19.4	25.0	26.6
Provide independent living services	34.7	4.8	19.4	16.1	25.0
Provide transitional employment	29.8	6.5	24.2	18.5	21.0
Provide educational programs or services	19.4	4.8	37.9	19.4	18.5
Serve needs of people with economic disadvantages	29.0	8.1	21.8	25.0	16.1
Provide medical and restorative services	62.9	4.8	10.5	8.9	12.9

In conclusion, the 18 goals listed on Table 6 can be divided into three categories: vocational, independent living and housing, and medical. Vocational goals were ranked higher than the other two categories. Within the vocational goals, general goals tended to have higher percents of acceptance than the more specific goals.

Although the goals listed on Table 6 could be classified according to type, a more powerful statistical tool was used to determine the underlying relationships between these 18 goals. The goals were subjected to a factor principal components factor analysis; the rotated component matrix is presented on Table 7. The total variance accounted for by these six factors was 86.727 percent. Within each factor the three to five goals having the highest loadings are highlighted; these were used to name the particular factor. The six factors and the percent of variance accounted for by each factor are presented below.

Factor 1 - Vocational Development (22.663% of variance accounted for). This factor loaded heavily on improving the quality of life, providing specific vocational services, achieving vocational goals, serving as an advocate, and offering work-ready employees. These goals involved the general vocational development of the consumer and the provision of two general services to help to achieve that goal.

Factor 2 - Employment and Employment Service (20.116% of variance accounted for). Factor 2 loaded on the following goals: providing employment for persons with disabilities, providing job-skills training, providing long-term employment, providing transition employment, and work-ready employees. This factor differed from Factor 1 in that it contained more specific goals that provide employment services.

Factor 3 - Community Placement and Self-survival (14.384% of variance accounted for). The four goals loading the highest on this factor were as follows: providing independent living services, serving the needs of community employers, achieving competitive employment, and serving the disadvantaged. Each of the four goals dealt with either living in the community or working in the community. Unlike Factors 1 and 2, Factor 3 centered on activities that had to be performed outside of the facility.

Factor 4 - Education and Training (11.371% of variance accounted for). Providing educational programs, providing transitional employment, providing specific vocational services, and enabling consumers to achieve competitive employment have the common theme to provide either vocational training and education. These goals shared the teaching or training function.

Factor 5 - Nonvocational Needs (10.024% of variance accounted for). The three goals loading the highest on this factor were the following: providing medical and restorative services, independent living services, and providing housing or residential services, which are clearly medical or shelter goals.

Table 7. Factor Analysis of Organizational Goals

Facility Goals	Component on Rotated Matrix					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Provide medical & restorative services	-.246	-.187	-.139	.107	.847	.170
Provide specific vocational rehabilitation services	.800	.125	.245	.394	-.049	-.029
Provide employment for persons with disability	.254	.832	.019	.139	.074	-.017
Provide vocational services to persons in community	-.090	.085	.100	.074	.013	.904
Provide educational programs or services	.184	.057	.101	.915	-.073	.050
Provide job skills training	.058	.806	.040	.186	.199	.053
Provide independent living services	.157	-.017	.859	.049	.302	.053
Provide housing or residential services	.069	.399	.267	-.225	.725	-.322
Provide long-term employment	.302	.831	-.213	.078	-.210	-.107
Provide transitional employment	.251	.481	.404	.609	-.083	.259
Work ready employees to businesses	.591	.464	.229	.213	-.425	.129
Improve quality of life for disabled	.914	.177	-.228	-.015	-.102	-.137
Enable consumers to achieve their vocational goals	.833	.363	.196	.144	.066	-.187
Enable consumers to achieve competitive employment	.581	.285	.509	.369	-.095	-.139
Serve as an advocate for disabled	.691	-.270	-.115	-.418	-.116	.422
Serve needs of community employers	-.031	.081	.855	.182	-.328	.086
Serve needs of disadvantaged	.664	.042	.455	.340	-.047	.400
Serve as an employer in community	-.064	.777	.341	-.166	-.226	.013
Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings Percent of variance accounted for by factor	22.663	20.116	14.384	11.371	10.024	8.169

Factor 6 - Social Awareness (8.169 3% of variance accounted for). The final factor loaded the most on the following goals: providing vocational services, advocacy, and needs of the disadvantaged. This rather weak factor appears to deal with a general awareness of needs.

The first three factors account for over 57 percent of the variance. All three factors centered on employment, vocational development, and placement.

Consumer Service Outcomes for 1996 and 1999

Outcomes for 1996 and projected outcomes for 1999 are presented in descending order by their 1996 weighted means on Table 8. In reviewing this table, it becomes obvious that for each outcome there are very small differences in the percentages between 1996 and 1999. Each outcome for 1996 and predicted outcome for 1999 was compared using a Chi-square statistic. The lack of statistically significant differences between outcomes indicated that no differences between present and future outcomes were expected.

The three most common outcomes were *Supported employment, Sheltered*, and *Employment competitive integrated.* Over half of the organizations did not have outcomes for *Facility-based integrated employment* (50.9%) and *Competitive, nonintegrated setting* (60.2%). CRPs placed most of their vocational emphasis on competitive and supported employment outcomes. The nine outcomes contained five different types of employment; supported, sheltered, and competitive employment had the highest weighted means. The three types of employment differ in support, job placement, expectations, and philosophy. The fact that these different employment approaches were the highest ranked outcomes indicated that CRPs provide a variety of employment services.

The percentages for each outcome indicated that for all outcomes the most common response was *1 to 15 percent*. The percent for each response decreased rapidly after the *14 to 40 percent* rating. For each outcome, the majority of positive outcomes were less than 40 percent. The highest percentages of *85 to 100 percent* were from *Independent living* (6.4%) and *Sheltered employment* (6.5%). These were followed by *Competitive, integrated employment* at 5.6 percent. The two employment outcomes with the highest number of responses in the *85 to 100 percent* were for outcomes usually considered at the extremes of desirability. *Competitive, integrated employment* is commonly considered the most desirable employment outcome; *Sheltered employment* is commonly considered the least desirable employment outcome.

The underlying relationships between the 1996 outcomes were determined through the use of a principal components factor analysis, with a varimax rotation (Table 9). This procedure resulted in four factors that accounted for 65.625 percent of the total variance. Within each factor, the two or three highest loadings were the basis for naming each factor.

Table 8. Consumer Outcomes for 1996 and Estimated for 1999 With Chi Squares Between Years (N = 108)

Outcomes	Year	Percent of Each Outcome						Chi Squares for Outcomes by Years	
		Not an Outcome	1 to 15%	15 to 40%	40 to 60%	60 to 85%	85 to 100%	Value	p
Supported employment	1996	21.3	30.6	27.8	6.5	9.3	4.6	8.543	.071
	1999	19.4	21.3	24.1	16.7	9.3	9.3		
Sheltered	1996	35.2	16.7	13.0	15.7	13.0	6.5	3.652	.518
	1999	30.6	25.0	15.7	13.9	8.3	6.5		
Employment, competitive, integrated	1996	19.4	35.2	21.3	9.3	9.3	4.6	2.267	.645
	1999	12.0	26.9	29.6	11.1	13.0	7.4		
Live independently in community	1996	33.9	28.4	11.9	7.3	11.9	6.4	1.755	.751
	1999	33.0	24.8	9.2	9.2	16.5	7.3		
Earnings sufficient to be self-supporting	1996	30.3	32.1	20.2	8.3	6.4	2.8	4.050	.423
	1999	22.9	27.5	19.3	16.5	10.1	3.7		
Maintenance (e.g., Declining health status)	1996	38.5	42.2	12.8	4.6	.9	.9	1.754	.845
	1999	33.9	38.5	18.3	7.3	.9	.9		
Facility-based, integrated employment	1996	50.9	25.0	13.9	7.4	.9	1.9	1.698	.798
	1999	38.9	30.6	13.9	10.2	3.7	2.8		
Competitive, non-integrated setting	1996	60.2	24.1	10.2	3.7	0.0	1.9	2.961	.634
	1999	57.4	21.3	11.1	6.5	1.9	1.9		
Refer to another rehabilitation program	1996	39.4	54.1	3.7	0.0	1.8	.9	4.354	.386
	1999	38.5	54.1	5.5	0.0	1.8	0.0		

Note: df = 4 for all X^2 s.

Table 9. Factor Analysis of Facility Outcomes for 1996

1996 Outcomes	Component on Rotated Matrix			
	1	2	3	4
Competitive, integrated employment	.736	-.050	-.065	.230
Competitive, non-integrated employment	.012	.769	.326	.228
Facility-based, integrated employment	.086	.818	-.214	-.170
Supported employment	.147	-.050	.032	.729
Sheltered employment	-.628	.085	.127	.467
Live independently in community	.712	-.023	.233	-.014
Earning sufficient to be self-supporting	.814	.297	.055	-.076
Maintenance (e.g., declining health status)	-.013	.083	.860	.081
Referred to another rehabilitation program	.183	-.176	.508	-.471
Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings				
Percent of variance accounted for by factor	24.091	15.542	13.633	12.359

Factor 1 - Community and Employment Integration (24.091% of variance accounted for). This factor contains almost 25 percent of the variance. The three outcomes loading the highest were *Earning sufficient to be self-supporting*, *Competitive, integrated employment*, and *Live independently in community*. These three outcomes form the very basis of what is expected from adults in our society - working and living without supervision. *Sheltered employment* had a negative factor loading of -.628 on this factor. This high, negative loading reflects that most of the respondents saw sheltered employment as being the opposite of self-support and independence.

Factor 2 - Employment, Regardless of Setting (15.542 % of variance accounted for). The two outcomes with the highest loading on this second factor were employment items: *Competitive non-integrated* and *Facility-based integrated*. Although both of these factors center on employment, the two outcomes have different settings, one in the community and one not in the community.

Factor 3 - Maintenance (13.663% of variance accounted for). The common theme in this factor is being kept in one status until a change can be made. Maintaining and being referred to another program load the highest on this factor.

Factor 4 - Supported Employment (12.359% of variance accounted for). The key outcome in this factor is supported employment. The second highest loading is from sheltered

employment. The relationship between these two apparently different outcomes is that for many consumers sheltered employment comes before supported employment with many persons working as sheltered employees while waiting for a supported employment position.

Service Populations

This section presents data on the mean percent of consumers with various characteristics served by CRPs in 1996, the mean number of consumers served annually in 1996, and the anticipated changes in these populations for 1999. The results, presented on Table 10, are arranged in descending order by percent of consumers served.

The mean percent of disabled persons served was 89.58 percent and the average number served per CRP was 395.88. All 106 CRPs served persons with disabilities; 97 served persons with severe disabilities; 95 served persons with multiple disabilities. In the average CRP, 42.07 percent had severe disabilities and 35.02 had multiple disabilities.[2] *Working age* adults were the second largest number of consumers served, both in mean numbers (366.17) and mean percent served (77.30%). The inverse of this group were the relative small percentages of *Youth* (6.49%) and *Senior citizens* (6.38%) served. While women are slightly over half of the general population, they were only 41.04 percent of population served by CRPs. Persons from *Minority backgrounds* were less than 20 percent of those served.

There was a considerable difference between the mean percentages coming from inner city and rural locations. Sixteen point three percent of the 106 respondents served persons from inner cities; almost 40 percent of the CRPs served persons from rural areas. Some other service populations were *Welfare recipients, Long-term unemployed, Public offenders*, and *Displaced workers*, categories considered to be "disadvantaged." While all persons in these disadvantaged categories may not have had a definable disability, the mean of 89.58 percent of all consumers being disabled strongly implied that many persons in these groups possessed a disabling condition.

For 1999, 60.4 percent of the respondents anticipated increases in the number of *Persons with disabilities* and of 55.7 percent of the respondents anticipated increases in the number of *Persons with severe disabilities.* These are the two most common disability categories of persons presently served. Almost 60 percent expected an increase in the *Working age* adults. Increases of about 50 percent were expected among *School to work transition* (51.9%), persons from *Minority backgrounds* (50.9%), *Senior citizens* (50.0%), and *Welfare recipients* (49.1%). Traditional CRP service population has always been persons with disabilities; more recently transition programs have become well established. In 1996, *Welfare recipients* comprised 15 percent of the number of persons served by CRPs (Table 10). This is expected either to remain the same or increase by about 98 percent of the respondents. Thus, it appears that CRPs view welfare recipients as a major emerging population. In spite of the anticipated increase in serving women, only half of the respondents served *Families* (50.0%) and slightly less than half served *Infants and children* (48.1%).

[2]Because the categories on Table 10 are not mutually exclusive, neither numbers nor percentages equal the total number of persons or the total percentage of persons served.

Table 10. Service Populations: 1996 Percent Served and Mean Number Served and 1999 Estimated Change (N = 106)

Service Population Characteristic or Label	1996 Consumer Served		Percent Estimated for 1999			
	Percent of Consumers Served	Mean Number Served Annually	Not Served	Decrease	No Change	Increase
Persons with disabilities	89.58	395.88	13.2	5.7	20.8	60.4
Working age (18 to 65 years)	77.30	366.17	18.9	8.5	13.2	59.4
Persons with severe disabilities	42.07	188.68	17.9	5.7	20.8	55.7
Females	41.04	201.46	16.0	5.7	37.7	40.6
Rural communities	39.55	104.87	31.1	2.8	24.5	41.5
Persons with multiple disabilities	35.05	119.48	39.6	1.9	14.2	44.3
Minority backgrounds	18.10	104.71	19.8	5.7	22.6	50.9
Inner-city locations	16.30	54.43	45.3	.9	28.3	25.5
Previously institutionalized	16.12	49.37	36.8	5.7	23.6	34.0
Welfare recipients	14.98	63.02	26.4	1.9	22.6	49.1
Long-term unemployed	14.36	42.49	41.5	3.8	25.5	29.2
Families	9.42	55.19	50.0	0.0	29.2	20.8
Youth (under age 18)	6.49	51.32	34.9	6.6	20.8	37.7
Senior citizens (65+years)	6.38	33.59	25.5	9.4	15.1	50.0
Infants and children	5.46	31.53	48.1	.9	31.1	19.8
Substance abuse	5.35	21.41	34.0	0.0	34.0	32.1
School-to-work transition	4.75	18.75	29.2	6.6	12.3	51.9
Public Offenders	1.72	4.37	38.7	1.9	34.0	25.5
Displaced workers	1.53	3.06	50.9	1.9	29.2	17.9
Immigrants	.94	5.39	54.7	1.9	27.4	16.0

Revenues and Expenditures

Tables 11 through 17 present the financial picture of the CRPs. Even after modifying the outliers in the frequency distributions, many of the distributions are not normal. For example, all variables on Tables 11 and 12 have standard deviations much larger than means. Therefore, the median value is given for most financial data. The reader will notice that many of these median values were zero. This was because at least half of the respondents to each table did not have a response to that particular item as an expense or income source. For example, on Table 11, the mean set-aside operations income was $184,062 and the median was 0. This implies that half of the sample of 82 for that table had no income from set-aside operations.

Total revenues. Table 11 summarizes sources and amounts of revenue for 1996 from 82 service providers and their projections of changes for 1999. The large standard deviations in comparison to the means reflects the reality of a population which contains organizations that can range from small businesses with annual budgets of less than $160,000 to organizations with budgets over $40 million. These wide variations suggest that these data should be interpreted with caution.

The average organization had mean total revenue of $2,603,600 with fees from public sources accounting for about 60 percent of this amount. Mean income for other consumer fees was $218,842, a total revenue from consumer fees of 67 percent. Income from set-aside operations and business activities amounted to about 20 percent of the total income. Grants and other income comprised most of the remaining income (about 13%).

The organizations responding to the survey were more dependent on public fees than on business income. The right side of Table 11 contains the estimated changes for 1999. Of the total revenue sources, business income was expected to increase the most (67.1%). Income from set-aside operations was least expected to increase (20.7%). Income from fees, grants, and other income was expected to increase between 26.8 percent and 52.4 percent. Organizations anticipated greater increased income through their own business ventures than they did from fees for services. This suggests that organizations are becoming increasingly independent of a variety of fees for consumer services. However, since public fees for services still account for 60 percent of revenue, these fees will continue to be an important income source. We see this as a gradual change to business directed goals.

Total expenditures. Total organizational expenditures are presented on Table 12. Direct service staff wages and salaries accounted for over half of the mean total expenditures. Administration operations and wages and salaries for management accounted for over one-third of the total expenditures. It is interesting to note that consumer wages were less than seven percent of the total expenditures. For 1999 all expenditures were expected to increase between 44.6 percent and 66.1 percent, with the largest increase being direct services staff salaries. Consumer wages were expected to be the second largest increase.

Table 11. Revenues by Major Sources in Dollars for 1996 and Estimated Changes for 1999 (N = 82)

Source of Revenue	Revenues in Dollars for 1996			Estimated Changes for 1999			
	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Not a Revenue Source	Decrease %	No Change %	Increase %
Public agencies fees for services	3,311,875	1,649,000	4,922,345	9.8	23.2	14.6	52.4
Other sources	218,842	0	657,230	46.3	1.2	17.1	35.4
Set-aside operations income-producing activities	184,062	0	501,740	45.1	3.7	30.5	20.7
Business activities	865,432	227,052	1,530,165	15.9	4.9	12.2	67.1
Grants, gifts, etc.	181,248	29,800	397,196	26.8	7.3	20.7	45.1
All other revenue services	500,975	0	3,581,653	45.1	11.0	17.1	26.8
Total revenue	5,262,436	2,603,600	6,711,862	11.0	6.1	8.5	74.4

Table 12. Expenditures by Cost Centers in Dollars for 1996 and Estimated Changes for 1999 (N = 56)

Source of Expenditure	Total Expenditures in Dollars for 1996			Estimated Changes for 1999			
	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	No Response	Decrease %	No Change %	Increase %
Administrative operations	615,383	208,496	1,370,455	25.0	5.4	19.6	50.0
Management - wages & salaries	437,053	196,473	772,497	23.2	10.7	16.1	50.0
Direct service staff - wages & salaries	1,610,345	720,500	2,506,992	19.6	5.4	8.9	66.1
Consumers - wages	207,128	98,000	362,081	30.4	7.1	7.1	55.4
Physical Plant	407,057	137,368	710,987	30.4	8.9	16.1	44.6
Total Expenditures	3,276,968	1,872,806	4,450,219	14.3	5.4	7.1	73.2

Ratio of assets to liabilities. Table 13 has the ratio of assets to liabilities for 1996 and 1999. The ratio for each CRP responding to this item was calculated by dividing assets by liabilities. The frequency distributions for 1996 and 1999 were then calculated. A ratio of 1.00 means that an organization's assets equaled its liabilities. As seen on Table 13, for both 1996 and 1999, the median ratio indicates that assets are about 40 percent of the liabilities. This implies that many CRPs are operating at a fairly high debt to equity ratio, which could cause financial problems if these organizations have cash flow problems.

Table 13. Ratio of Assets to Liabilities for 1996 and 1999

Year	Descriptive Statistics			
	Number of Facilities	Mean Ratio of Assets to Liabilities	Median Ratio of Assets to Liabilities	Standard Deviation
1996	43	.637	.411	.706
1999 (estimated)	35	.588	.400	.614

Revenue from service fees. Tables 14 and 15 present sources of public service fees. Table 14 classifies public service fees according to state or county or local levels. Almost half the fees come from state level programs, such as vocational rehabilitation and mental health funds. County and local level fees accounted for almost 20 percent of fees for services. While both state and county funding sources were expected to increase by 1999, as indicated by the percent of "No change" responses, the rate of increase was not expected to be large.

Table 15 divides fees for services into numerous specific funding and program sources. The mean percentage of each fee is presented for 1996; these mean percentages include zero responses for sites that did not receive fees from specific sources. Because at least half of the responding CRPs did not receive funds from specific sources, most of the median values are zeros. For example, the mean of .07 in VA funds indicates that most of the 48 CRPs did not receive any service fees from this agency; the median of zero confirmed this. The highest three funding sources were VR (24.44%), developmental disabilities (36.68%), and mental health (26.22%). These three sources accounted for 73.42 percent of CRP revenue from service fees. Less than five percent of any other funds came from a single source. The remaining sources represented a variety of local (e.g., United Way, individuals and families, and school districts), state (e.g., social services) and national (e.g., U.S. Department of Labor) level funding by governmental or nonprofit agencies.

Table 14. Proportion of Revenue from Fees Paid for Services by State and County Public Funds (N = 90)

Source of Revenue	Percent of Total Revenue from Fees in 1996			Estimated Changes for 1999			
	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	No Response	Decrease %	No Change %	Increase %
Fees from state-level programs	48.59	49.00	35.13	14.4	21.1	37.8	26.7
Fees from county-level programs	18.01	4.10	26.74	30.0	12.2	41.1	16.7

Table 15. Proportion of Total Revenue Obtained From Fees From Specific Funding Sources in 1996 and Estimated Changes for 1999 (N = 48)

Source of Revenue	Percent of Total Revenue from Fees for 1996			Estimated Changes for 1999			
	Mean Percent of Total Income	Median Percent of Total Income	Standard Deviation	No Response	Decrease %	No Change %	Increase %
Developmental disabilities	36.68	27.50	39.06	43.8	18.8	20.8	16.7
Vocational rehabilitation	24.44	10.64	32.41	25.0	12.5	27.1	35.4
Mental health	12.03	0.0	26.22	43.8	4.2	35.4	16.7
Social services	4.97	0.0	19.27	45.8	2.1	39.6	12.5
United Way	3.37	0.0	6.36	37.5	6.3	50.0	6.3
Other sources of fees: Individuals and families	3.20	0.0	8.63	43.8	4.2	29.2	22.9
School district, education	2.74	0.0	11.29	37.5	6.3	35.4	20.8
Department of Labor	2.46	0.0	10.11	52.1	6.3	41.7	0.0
Family services	1.68	0.0	7.94	52.1	4.2	41.7	2.1
Community support programs	1.50	0.0	4.89	54.2	2.1	37.5	6.3
Other sources of fees: Other private	1.25	0.0	3.59	52.1	0.0	27.1	20.8
Private Insurance	1.24	0.0	4.65	45.8	0.0	35.4	18.8
Welfare	.73	0.0	3.09	52.1	0.0	25.0	22.9
Social Security	.53	0.0	2.92	50.0	2.1	35.4	
Worker compensation	.50	0.0	2.16	52.1	0.0	35.4	12.5
Other sources of fees: Consumer controlled	.27	0.0	1.49	56.3	0.0	33.3	10.4
Veterans Administration	.07	0.0	.45	54.2	2.1	43.8	0.0
Health services	.02	0.0	.14	54.2	2.1	37.5	6.3

By 1999, organizations expected the highest percent of increase to be in serving vocational rehabilitation (35.4%) and welfare clients (22.9%). School districts, mental health, and developmental disabilities were also expected to have large increases. Rehabilitation organizations expect to keep present funding sources as they expand into areas of nontraditional funds. The key trends in Table 15 were as follows: (a) reduced importance on VR funds, (b) greater diversity of funding, (c) increased consumer and family controlled funds, and (d) increased funds from welfare.

Business income. Table 16 contains business activity income. As with the other tables in this financial section, the median values of zero indicate that at least half of the CRPs had no income in this area. Service contracts (8.68%) and subcontracting to business (9.74%) accounted for the highest percentages of business income. These were followed by prime manufacturing (5.10%). As with other results reported in this section, the large standard deviations as compared with the mean indicate a very wide range of responses. Business activity was not a major source of income for many CRPs.

The section of Table 16 containing anticipated changes for 1999 makes three major points. First, there was a very high "no response" which indicated that many CRPs did not have business activities. For example, the "no response" rate of 34.2 percent for both service contracts and subcontracting indicated that about one-third of the respondents did not engage in these activities. Second, business activities were expected to increase. The largest predicted increase was with subcontracting; 39.5 percent believed that an increase would occur. Third, almost no decreases were expected. In conclusion, organizations had a mix of business income and expected the two major sources of that income to increase by 1999.

Cost recovery and overhead. Table 17, the final financial table, presents data on costs and overhead. In 1996 organization fees covered a mean percentage of 75.99 percent of the cost of providing services. For 1999 these fees are expected to cover the same percentage service costs. This means that the average organization only recovered 75 percent of its costs of providing services. The remaining 25 percent needed to come from other sources. Many facilities used profits from business activities to make up this difference. The estimated overhead percentage was 18.8.

Table 16. Primary Sources of Business Activity Income for 1996 and Estimated Changes for 1999 (N = 76)

Business Activity	Percent of Total Revenue in 1996			Estimated Changes for 1999			
	Mean Percent of Total Income	Median Percent of Total Income	Standard Deviation	No Response	Decrease %	No Change %	Increase %
Prime manufacturing	5.10	0.0	14.89	47.4	2.6	27.6	22.4
Service contracts	8.68	1.00	17.10	34.2	1.3	27.6	36.8
Subcontracting to business	9.74	3.50	16.67	34.2	7.9	18.4	39.5
Subcontracting to government	2.06	0.0	9.49	55.3	0.0	26.3	18.4
Residential, property management	.52	0.0	1.89	56.6	1.3	30.3	11.8
Other business activity	3.52	0.0	12.26	60.5	2.6	23.7	13.2

Table 17. Proportions of Program Costs Covered and Percent of Estimated Overhead (N = 75)

Proportion of Service Program Costs Recovered from Fees	Descriptive Statistics	
	Mean Percent	Standard Deviation
1996	75.99	27.77
1999	77.33	26.78
Estimated overhead	19.78	15.88

Anticipated Impact of Funding Changes

Sixty-five of the 124 respondents (52.5%) anticipated that changes in funding would impact their programs and organization. Table 18 lists the possible effects of funding changes for the 65 organizations anticipating change, ranked in descending order by the percentage expecting an increase in 1999. The most common cost-related problem areas were *Cost to provide services* (67.7%), *Agency's overhead costs* (50.8%), *Administrative costs* (49.2%), *Total consumers served* (49.2%), *Persons served with severe disabilities* (47.7%), *Staff turnover* (46.2%), and the *Variety of services offered* (47.2%). In general, respondents expected a loss of services, increases in costs in providing services, and reductions in the number of persons served. Obviously, if these problems cannot be solved, reduced funding levels would lead to shrinking programs, eliminating programs, and laying off staff. Increases in service costs could also change the proportion of services covered by fees.

Table 19 presents the results of a principal components factor analysis with a varimax rotation for the possible areas of impact. This procedure resulted in five factors that accounted for 69.555 percent of the total variance. Within each factor, the two or three highest loadings were the basis for naming each factor.

Factor 1 - Variety of Services and Attention to Populations (20.483% of the variance accounted for). This factor centers on a potential loss of the number of services and the persons affected by these services. The three highest loadings were on the following impacts: *Vocational services available, Number of service programs,* and *Choices of available services*. These were followed in loadings in two consumer populations: *Attention to consumer concerns* and *Emphasis on nondisabled persons.*

Factor 2 - Consumer Population Mix (16.284% of the variance accounted for). The theme of this factor is possible changes in number, quality, and mix of consumers served. *Persons served with disabilities, Persons served with severe disabilities, Total number of consumers served*, and *Agency control over consumers* had the four highest loadings. Two items with less loadings were *Proportion of part-time staff* and *Quality of consumer outcomes.*

Factor 3 - Cost to Serve (13.160% of the variance accounted for). This factor loads the heaviest of three items effected directly by costs: *Administrative costs, Cost to provide services*, and *Overhead costs*. Small loadings were on *Dollars per consumer* and *Staff qualifications*. *Staff qualifications* most likely loaded on this factor because staff salaries and fringe benefits are the single largest expense for all service programs. Staff salaries and fringe benefits are often directly related to *Staff qualifications*.

Factor 4 - Quality of Services (11.830% of the variance accounted for). The financial impact on quality of services is the key ingredient of this factor. Respondents were concerned about quality of services and their impact on consumer outcomes. In addition, quality of services was reflected in attention to consumer concerns, staff qualifications, and dollars per consumer.

Factor 5 - Staff Quality (7.798% of the variance accounted for). The final factor contained impacts directly related to the quality of the staff and their ability to provide services: consumer/staff ratio and staff turnover.

Table 18. Possible Areas Impacted by Changes in Funding (N = 65)

Possible Areas of Impact	Percent of Change in Importance			
	No Response	Decrease	No Change	Increase
Cost to provide services	7.7	16.9	7.7	67.7
Agency's overhead costs	9.2	9.2	30.8	50.8
Administrative costs	10.8	12.3	27.7	49.2
Total consumers served	7.7	23.1	20.0	49.2
Persons served with severe disabilities	7.7	23.1	21.5	47.7
Staff turnover	9.2	12.3	32.3	46.2
Variety of services offered	9.2	26.2	18.5	46.2
Attention to consumer concerns	10.8	20.0	24.6	44.6
Proportion of part-time staff	12.3	6.2	38.5	43.1
Service choices available to consumers	10.8	32.3	15.4	41.5
Persons served with disabilities	10.8	21.5	26.2	41.5
Vocational services available	6.2	30.8	23.1	40.0
Number of service programs	10.8	24.6	26.2	38.5
Quality of consumer outcomes	10.8	21.5	32.3	35.4
Emphasis on serving persons without disabilities	13.8	12.3	38.5	35.4
Dollars spent per consumer	10.8	40.0	18.5	30.8
Quality of service programs	10.8	20.0	40.0	29.2
Staff-to-consumer ratio	9.2	29.2	32.3	29.2
Direct service staff qualification	9.2	21.5	41.5	27.7
Agency control over consumers	12.3	32.3	40.0	15.4

Table 19. Factor Analysis of Possible Areas of Impact Due to Changes in Funding

Possible Areas of Impact Due to Changes in Funding	Component on Rotated Matrix				
	1	2	3	4	5
Vocational services available	.802	.218	.077	.319	-.068
Number of service programs	.825	.109	.044	.266	-.030
Quality of service programs	.352	.157	.099	.829	.011
Quality of consumer outcomes	.369	.430	.129	.599	-.107
Total number of consumers served	.355	.732	.026	-.029	.059
Agency control over consumers served	-.061	.622	.289	.023	.069
Persons served with disabilities	.169	.882	.109	.219	-.025
Persons served with severe disabilities	.174	.830	.067	.195	.073
Emphasis on non-disabled persons	.640	.043	.206	.016	.318
Choices of available services	.767	.257	.253	.088	-.069
Attention to consumer concerns	.699	.184	.200	.510	-.049
Staff qualifications	.136	.259	.357	.598	.091
Proportion of part-time staff	.116	.541	.050	.200	.280
Consumer/staff ratio	-.133	.141	.207	.041	.736
Staff turnover	.123	.097	.019	-.038	.720
Dollars per consumer	-.095	.082	.388	.561	.443
Cost to provide services	.123	.019	.793	.211	.263
Administrative costs	.025	.080	.913	.179	.091
Overhead costs	.249	.292	.750	.086	-.080
Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings					
Percent of variance accounted for by factor	20.483	16.284	13.160	11.830	7.798

Chapter V

Discussion

The basic purposes of the study were to describe CRP characteristics for 1996 and to predict conditions in 1999. In this section the results will be discussed and conclusions reached. This discussion includes sample size, goals, outcomes, service populations, financial aspects, and impact of reduced funding. The conclusions center on the anticipated changes between 1996 and 1999.

Number of CRPs and Overall Size

Over the past several years, the number of facilities appears to have declined. Menz (1990) reported that between 1980 and 1989 the number of facilities grew from 5,500 to 7,000. In 1989, the average annual number of consumers was 335.6; by 1996 this number had increased to 637.05, almost double the 1989 number. This increase in the number of consumers served was paralleled by increases in annual revenue from $1.393 million to $6.230 million. This increase in size was offset by a decline in the total number of CRPs presently operating. Following the first mailing, over 200 surveys were returned as undeliverable from organizations that either had merged with other organizations or were no longer providing services. As these organizations are becoming fewer in number, they are becoming larger both in number of consumers served and annual revenues.

In general, the facilities in the sample offered a common list of vocational programs: supported employment, job skills and work adjustment, sheltered employment, and vocational evaluation. The content of these programs closely corresponds to the identified goals and desired outcomes.

Goals and Outcomes

Conceptually, goals and outcomes are related. Organizational goals must be established prior to defining desired outcomes. The specific services offered are derived from organizational goals; and desired outcomes depend on the quality of the services provided.

The most important core goals included both general (e.g., *Improve the quality of life of persons with disabilities*) as well as more specific goals (e.g., *Provide job skills training*). The results from the factor analysis supported this differentiation between general vocational development and more specific employment and employment services. As indicated on Table 6, the goals with the highest percentage of "core" ratings centered on direct services to consumers, such as providing employment and providing specific vocational services. These services focus on the needs of the consumer and imply that consumers and their referral sources are the major customers of the organization. However, employers are emerging as another customer. Most respondents indicated that organizational goals include *Providing work-ready employees to business* and *Serve needs of community's employers* were among their goals. While organizations emphasized the traditional goals of general and specific service provision to consumers, they are beginning to more directly serve the needs of employers.

Outcomes were considered for years 1996 and 1999. The percentage of consumers who

achieved each outcome category (1 to 5) declined from the most common response in the *1 to 15 percent* category. For example, supported employment decreased from 30.6 percent from the *1 to 15 percent* category to only 4.6 percent at the *85 to 100 percent* category (Table 8). For 1996, most CRPs expected successful outcomes of less than 40 percent. This percentage is largely consistent with the percentages of successful outcomes reported in the literature and reflects the current reality for CRPs. The lack of significant differences between 1996 and anticipated 1999 outcomes indicated that outcomes were not expected to change dramatically. CRPs experienced a modest degree of successful outcomes for 1996 and anticipated the same degree of success for 1999. Given the increasingly complexity of consumer problems and anticipated changes in funding, these indications appear realistic.

The goal and outcome data share two common elements. First, the most common outcomes were *Competitive integrated employment* and *Supported employment* which agree with the finding of general and specific goals respectively. Second, in the outcome factor analysis the first two factors were *Community and employment integration* and *Employment, regardless of setting*. The *Community and employment integration* factor includes items on self-support and independent living. These general outcomes are analogous to the goals factor. The second outcome factor, *Employment, regardless of setting* centers on specific vocational outcomes.

Populations Served

The most commonly served populations were persons with disabilities, persons with severe disabilities, and persons with multiple disabilities. Most CRPs were founded to provide vocational and related services to persons with disabilities. In addition, if *Substance abuse* and *Previously institutionalized* are included with the three specific disability groups, then the overwhelming majority of persons presently served in CRPs have a disability. Two other important categories of consumers are being served in increasingly numbers. Although *School-to-work transition* and *Welfare recipients* have been served by CRPs for many years, these two populations are expected in increase by about 50 percent. Persons from *Minority backgrounds* and *Females* are also expected to increase considerately, as are persons from inner cities and rural communities.

In the near future, facilities will continue to serve persons with disabilities, as they always have. However, these persons are more likely to have severe and/or multiple disabilities. In addition, facilities will begin to increasingly serve consumers who are also economically disadvantaged, such as welfare, public offenders, long-term unemployed, and persons from both inner cities and rural areas. Persons with disabilities and those who are disadvantaged are not mutually exclusive groups. Many disadvantaged persons also have a variety of disabilities and many persons with disabilities live in poverty.

Revenues, Expenditures, and Revenue Sources

CRPs present a complex financial picture. Although the total revenue of the average CRP was $5.262 million, total revenues varied widely from under $160,000 to over $40 million. If we assume there are 7,000 CRPs in the U.S., then just from the perspective of total revenues, CRPs are a major industry.

The major purpose of facilities is to provide services to persons with vocational and employment problems. By their very nature, CRPs are people intensive in two ways. First, staff are needed to provide these services. For all CRPs in the study, the single highest budget item was staff salaries and wages. The single greatest source of revenue for CRPs are fees for consumer services.

Only 60 percent of the sample had any income from business activities. The major sources of business revenue were from sub-contracting with business and service contracts. Commonly, sub-contracting means sheltered employment and service contracts mean mobile crews. Judging from the number of sites responding to the business activity section of the questionnaire and from the low mean percentages on Table 16, business activities are not nearly as important as income sources as are fees for services. This situation is expected to remain true for the near future.

While CRPs will continue to obtain most funds from public sources, there have been shifts in these sources. In 1996, 48.59 percent of consumer fees came from state-level programs and 18.01 percent from county or local government. The plurality of respondents anticipated no major change in these two basic funding sources by 1999. Historically, most facilities have received the majority of their funds from state level, mostly VR and developmental disabilities. Although local-level funds have increased over the past several years, state-level funds are still the major funding sources.

The three funding sources (i.e., VR, developmental disabilities, and mental health) provide about 75 percent of funding. As seen in the literature review, these three have been the major sources of CRP funding for about 15 years. Although the percentage of VR funding has declined and MR/DD and mental health has increased, these three have remained the major funding sources and are anticipated to continue to be the major funding sources in the near future. A variety of public, private, federal, state, local, and school district funding sources comprise the remaining 25 percent. This study identified *School to work*, *Welfare Recipients*, and *Individuals and families* as emerging service groups. The anticipated funding increases presented on Table 15 agrees with this finding. Finally, there has been considerable recent discussion on consumer vouchers or consumer controlled funds. Although only a very small percent of incomes comes from this source, it is expected to grow in the near future.

Changes in Funding

About half of the CRPs anticipated that changes in funding would impact their programs. This portion of the sample expected increases in costs, service quality, and number of persons served. The variety of services, quality of these services, and number of consumers served are expected to increase. However, costs per consumer, overhead, and staff turnover will also increase. Thus, CRPs expected that while they will be able to serve more consumers, this will be done with increased overhead and other costs. Service providers are forced to provide services to a wide variety of difficult-to-serve consumers while at the same time facing the joint problems of increasing overhead and decreasing funding per consumer. This commonly leads to difference between cost and expenses that is "made up" from business income.

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary. The following is a summary of the major findings.

1. **CRP characteristics**. In 1996, the "typical" CRP served an average of 219 consumers daily and had total revenues of $5.262 million. Facilities varied greatly in size and revenues. Over 60 percent of the CRPs offered programs in the following areas: supported employment, sheltered employment programs, job skills and work adjustment programs, and vocational evaluation and assessment. Almost 60 percent offered placement programs.

2. **Goals**. Facilities pursue general and specific core vocational goals. General goals to improve quality of life and enable consumers to achieve competitive employment are widely accepted by most CRPs. Specific goals relate more to specific services and programs and are most commonly (a) to provide job skills training, (b) to provide employment of persons with disabilities, and (c) to provide specific vocational services. In addition to serving consumer and referral source needs, CRPs are beginning to identify employer needs as a program goal.

3. **Outcomes**. The most common outcomes were *supported employment, competitive employment*, and *earnings enough to be self-supporting*. Most CRPs reported achieving these desired outcomes between 1 and 40 percent of the time, indicating modest to fair success. There were no significant differences between outcomes for 1996 and 1999; this indicated that no major changes are anticipated.

4. **Populations**. All facilities served persons with disabilities and most served persons with either severe or multiple disabilities. Persons with disabilities are expected to continue to be the present and future focus for CRP services and programs. Increases in welfare recipients and school-to-work transition populations are expected by about half of the sample; these are emerging populations. The percent of consumers served who are women, ethnic minorities, senior citizens, from inner cities, and from rural areas are expected to increase. These changes will result in a considerable consumer diversity in most rehabilitation organizations.

5. **Revenues and expenditures**. CRPs have a wide range of revenue and expenditures. In terms of overall revenue and expenditures, they range from small businesses to organizations with yearly revenues of over $40 million. Within this range, however, most revenues come from public fees for consumer services. The three most common sources of these fees are state VR, developmental disabilities, and mental health. These are expected to continue for the near future. Emerging sources of fees are from welfare, schools, and individuals and families. Business activity income is not nearly as an important revenue source as are fees for services.

6. **Proportion of costs covered**. Fees for services covered a mean percentage of 76 percent of the cost of providing services. For 1999, these fees were expected to cover the same

percentage of service costs. The remaining 25 percent comes from other sources, most often from business income.

7. **Impacts of changes in funding**. Slightly over half the sample believed that expected changes in funding would affect the operations and provision of services in a negative way in cost to provide services, agency's overhead costs, total consumers served, persons served with severe disabilities, staff turnover, and attention to consumer concerns.

Conclusions. Presently, in terms of consumer size and total revenues, there are no "typical" CRPs. Because of these two factors and the communities in which they operate, CRPs vary greatly. In comparing the results of these surveys with earlier Center surveys on facilities, it appears that the average CRP has increased in size and the number of CRPs has declined. This indicates a trend for CRPs to either become larger or to go out of business. In looking for common features in CRPs, one needs to move beyond funding amounts and size. Facilities share common goals of providing vocational services to persons with disabilities and others. Most of the services offered center on supported employment, competitive employment, vocational training, and noncompetitive employment. In achieving these common service goals, CRPs experience success with less than 40 percent of the consumers served. While this 40 percent figure may appear low, it roughly agrees with many of the current outcome studies. Finally, all CRPs serve mainly persons with disabilities and receive the majority of their revenues from public sources of fees for services.

Future changes in CRPs will differ from present conditions mostly in degree. The number of persons with severe and multiple disabilities are expected to increase. Services are expected to remain about the same and funding levels are not expected to keep pace with need or cost of providing services. Increased services will be provided to welfare recipients and youth moving from school to work. The number of minorities, women (most likely related to welfare reform), senior citizens, persons from inner city, and persons from rural areas will also increase.

Recommendations for additional research. The major methodology problem in this study was the low rate of return. After the first survey was mailed, the Center received several telephone calls from CRP staff who were concerned about the detailed nature of the financial and consumer demographics of the survey. Because these data were difficult and timely to provide, many either did not return the instrument or left blank many items. This was especially true for the first instrument. Future research into CRPs' funding, expenses, income sources, and consumer demographics will need to achieve a balance between requests for needed detail and the respondents' needs for brevity and ease of response.

As a result of this study, two additional studies will be conducted as a part of the Center's ongoing research into the nature of community-based rehabilitation programs. In the first study, data from the present study will be directly compared with the 1989 study by Menz which will provide precise information on changes in funding, expenditures, and consumers between the critical years of 1989 and 1997. The reader should note that during this time period CRPs changed greatly. The second new study will use a combination of survey research and interviews with CRP administrators, staff, and consumers in the years 1999 and 2001.

References

Bestgen, Y. K. (1992). Rehabilitation's 21st century client: Back to the future. In L. G. Perlman & C. E. Hansen (Eds.), *Rehabilitation facilities: Preparing for the 21st century* (A report on the 16th Mary E. Switzer Memorial Seminar, pp. 36-44). Reston, VA: National Rehabilitation Association.

Czerlinsky , T., & Gilbertson, A. (1985). *A national study of CARF accredited vocational rehabilitation facilities: Their structure and characteristics.* Menomonie: University of Wisconsin-Stout, Research and Training Center.

Giordano, G., & D'Alonzo, B. J. (1995). Challenge and progress in rehabilitation: A review of the past 25 years and preview for the future. *American Rehabilitation, 21*(3), 14-21.

Gray, R. L., & Gilbert, P. (1992). The funding debate confronting rehabilitation facilities: More money or better resource allocation. In L. G Perlman & C. E. Hanson (Eds.), *Rehabilitation facilities: Preparing for the 21st century* (A report on the 16th Mary E. Switzer Memorial Seminar, pp. 78-80). Reston, VA: National Rehabilitation Association.

Johnson, W. F., Botterbusch, K. F., & Menz, F. E. (1996). *Community resources accessed by community-based rehabilitation programs: A pilot study.* Menomonie: University of Wisconsin-Stout, Research and Training Center.

McNeil, J. (1993). *Americans with disabilities: 1991-1992.* U.S. Bureau of Census, Current Population Reports Series P70, #33. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Menz, F. E. (1985). Vocational rehabilitation facilities: The present environment, an overview. In L. Thornton & B. Shofner (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Region VI conference on future roles and functions of vocational rehabilitation facilities.* Hot Springs, AR: Regional Continuing Educational Center, University of Arkansas.

Menz, F. E. (1990, June). *1989 survey of vocational rehabilitation facilities: Initial profiles for the national sample and for NARF responding facilities.* Presentation made to the Vocational Development Committee of the National Association of Rehabilitation Facilities, San Diego, CA.

Menz, F. E. (1993). *Sustainability of community-based programs improving and sustaining quality community-based rehabilitation in rural communities.* Presented to the Annual Conference of the National Association of Rehabilitation Facilities, Seattle, WA.

Menz, F. E. (1994). *Continuing the trend toward community-based rehabilitation.* Presented to the Advisory Council Meeting of the Midwest Regional Head Injury Center for Rehabilitation and Prevention, Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago.

Menz, F. E. (1998). *Facts about community-based rehabilitation programs (CBRPS).* NIDRR presentation.

Menz, F. E., McAlees, D., Botterbusch, K., Thomas, D., Coker, C., & Flynn, M. (1997, December). *Where are community-based facilities going?* Paper presented at First National Employment Summit of the American Congress of Community Supports and Employment Services, Saint Louis, MO.

National Council on Disability (NCD). (1996). *Achieving independence: The challenge for the 21st century. A decade of progress in disability policy. Setting an agenda for the future.* Washington, DC: Author.

Shaw, K. J. (1992). The value of rehabilitation facilities. In L. G. Perlman & C. E. Hanson (Eds.), *Rehabilitation facilities: Preparing for the 21st century* (A report on the 16th Mary E. Switzer Memorial Seminar, pp. 66-76). Reston, VA: National Rehabilitation Association.

SPSS Inc. (1988). *SPSS-X user's guide.* Chicago: Author.

U.S. General Accounting Office (1993). *Vocational rehabilitation: Evidence for federal program's effectiveness is mixed.* (GAO/PEMD-93-19). Washington, DC: GAO.

Whitney-Thomas, J. Timmons, J. C., Thomas, D. M., Gilmore, D. S., & Fesko, S. L. (1997). *Changes in vocational rehabilitation practice since the 1992 Rehabilitation Act Amendments.* Boston, MA: Institute for Community Inclusion.

Appendices

Appendix A

Organizational Profile
First Survey

Organizational Profile

Instructions. Please complete this profile on your total organization. The *Profile* may be completed from annual reports, outcome studies, and related documents. Items ask for ratings of goals, counts of persons served, income and expenditures, and estimates of changes in funding or in impact of funding changes on your operations. Specific instructions are included for each section. The coded mailing label below will only be used to correlate data from your organizational and service profiles and eliminate unnecessary follow-up of responding organizations.

RETURN BY OCT. 20

Person Completing Organizational Survey:

Name

Phone

Year Organization Established

Vocational Rehabilitation Programs Provided by Organization. Please check the programs your organization provides. After checking the service programs, make enough photocopies of the *Service Program Profile* for each one you checked and ask appropriate staff to complete and return them to you to include when you return your completed *Organizational Profile*. See "definitions for services programs to be profiled."

- Evaluation and Assessment
- Job Skills and Work Adjustment Training
- Transitional Employment
- Supported Employment
- Competitive Placement
- Employment Services

Other Supportive and Non-Vocational Programs. Please identify other consumer service programs (e.g., Adult Day Services) the organization provides that are important resources to persons with disabilities and their families and/or represent revenue generating sources.

Goals of Organization. Please rate importance of each goal to your organization: 4=Core goal for organization, 3=Among most important goals, 2=Important goal for some programs, 1=Unimportant, 0=Not your goal.

Goals	Rated Importance				
Provide medical and restorative services	0	1	2	3	4
Provide specific vocational rehabilitation services	0	1	2	3	4
Provide employment for persons with disabilities	0	1	2	3	4
Provide vocational services to persons within community	0	1	2	3	4
Provide educational programs or services	0	1	2	3	4
Provide job skills training	0	1	2	3	4
Provide independent living services	0	1	2	3	4
Provide housing or residential services	0	1	2	3	4
Provide long-term employment	0	1	2	3	4
Provide transitional employment	0	1	2	3	4
Provide work-ready employees to businesses	0	1	2	3	4
Improve quality of life of person with disabilities	0	1	2	3	4
Enable consumers to achieve their vocational goals	0	1	2	3	4
Enable consumers to achieve competitive employment	0	1	2	3	4
Serve as advocate for disabled in community	0	1	2	3	4
Serve needs of community's employers	0	1	2	3	4
Serve needs of people with economic disadvantages	0	1	2	3	4
Serve as an employer in community	0	1	2	3	4
Other (please specify)	0	1	2	3	4

Research and Training Center on Community-Based Rehabilitation Programs, Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute, University of Wisconsin-Stout, 214 Tenth Avenue, Menomonie, WI 54751

Consumer Outcomes. Please estimate the proportion of consumers who achieved the following outcomes in 1994, 1996, and 1999 (estimated) using the following scale: 0=Not an outcome, 1=For 1 to 15% of consumers, 2=15 to 40%, 3=40 to 60%, 4=60 to 85%, 5=85 to 100% of consumers.

Outcomes (Individuals can achieve multiple outcomes)	**Counts Achieved** 1994	1996	**Estimated Percent 1999**
Competitive, integrated employment			0 1 2 3 4 5
Competitive, non-integrated setting			0 1 2 3 4 5
Facility-based, integrated employment			0 1 2 3 4 5
Supported employment			0 1 2 3 4 5
Sheltered employment			0 1 2 3 4 5
Live independently in community			0 1 2 3 4 5
Earnings sufficient to be self-supporting			0 1 2 3 4 5
Maintenance (e.g., declining health status)			0 1 2 3 4 5
Referred to another rehabilitation program			0 1 2 3 4 5
Other (please specify)			0 1 2 3 4 5

Counts of Consumers Served (all service programs) and Their Characteristics. Please provide *total counts* for your 1994, 1996, and 1999 (estimated) fiscal years. Then report the *numbers of consumers served annually* served according to selected populations and demographic characteristics.

Unduplicated Total Numbers Served	1994	1996	1999
Annual totals			
Average daily counts			
New clients by year			

Designated Service Populations (Individuals may fit more than one category)	**Count Served Annually** 1994	1996	1999
Individuals with disabilities			
Individuals with severe disabilities			
Individuals with multiple disabilities			
Welfare recipients			
Displaced workers			
Long-term unemployed			
Immigrants			
School-to-work transition (youth)			
Previously institutionalized			
Public offenders			
Substance abuse			

Specific Demographic Populations	1994	1996	1999
Minority backgrounds			
Females			
Infants and children			
Families			
Youth (under age 18)			
Working age (18 to 65 years)			
Senior citizens (65+ years)			
From inner-city settings/locations			
From rural communities/settings			

RETURN BY OCTOBER 20.

Revenue and Expenses. Please report major revenue sources for 1994, 1996, and estimates for 1999 in 1000's of dollars.

	Dollars in 1000s		
Revenues	**1994**	**1996**	**1999**
Total Revenue (all sources)			
Public fees for client services (e.g., state, county, local, federal)			
Other sources of fees for client services (e.g., consumer vouchers, insurance)			
Income from set-aside operations (e.g., NISH, JWOD, state-use)			
Income from other business activities (e.g., subcontracts, manufacturing)			
Income from private grants, contributions, investments, gifts, endowments			
All other income (e.g., capital campaigns)			
Expenditures	**1994**	**1996**	**1999**
Total Expenditures (all sources)			
Administrative operations			
Salaries and Wages			
Management			
Direct service staff			
Clients-consumer wages			
Physical plant			
	1994	**1996**	**1999**
Ratio of Assets to Liabilities	•	•	•

Sources and Anticipated Changes in Fees and Income. Please estimate percents of the organization's total revenue coming from selected funding and business income sources for 1994 and 1996. For 1999, circle the appropriate symbol to indicate whether you expect each source to increase in importance (+), not change (0), or decrease in importance (-).

Revenue Sources	**Percent of Total Revenue**		**Anticipated Change In Importance**
Fees From Public Sources	**1994**	**1996**	**By 1999**
State-level programs			+ 0 -
County-local programs			+ 0 -
			+ 0 -
Fees From Specific Programs	**1994**	**1996**	**1999**
Vocational Rehabilitation			+ 0 -
Mental Health			+ 0 -
Developmental disabilities			+ 0 -
Family services			+ 0 -
Welfare			+ 0 -
Social services			+ 0 -
Health services			+ 0 -
School district, education			+ 0 -
Community support programs			+ 0 -
Department of Labor			+ 0 -
Veterans Administration			+ 0 -
United Way			+ 0 -
Social Security			+ 0 -
Worker Compensation			+ 0 -
Private Insurance			+ 0 -

Other Sources for Fees	1994	1996	1999
Individuals and families			+ 0 -
Consumer controlled (e.g., vouchers)			+ 0 -
Other private sources			+ 0 -

Business Activity Income	1994	1996	1999
Prime manufacturing			+ 0 -
Service contracts			+ 0 -
Subcontracting to business			+ 0 -
Subcontracting to government			+ 0 -
Residential, property management			+ 0 -
Other business activity (please specify)			+ 0 -

Proportion of service program costs covered through fees paid for services.

In 1994 % In 1996 % Anticipate in 1999 %

If coverage less than 100%, what sources were used to recover or cover costs?

In 1994

In 1996

Estimated Overhead. As a percent of your organization's total operating expenses, what is your estimated overhead expenses? %

Impact of Changes in Funding. Has your organization detected significant impacts as a result of changes or shifts in funding of services since 1994?

Yes No

If "Yes", please estimate how changes in funding have impacted by circling the appropriate symbol using the following scale: Increases (+), no noticeable impact (0), or decreased (-).

Possible Areas Impacted	Rated Impact
Variety of services offered	+ 0 -
Vocational services available	+ 0 -
Number of service programs	+ 0 -
Quality of service programs	+ 0 -
Quality of outcomes achieved by consumers	+ 0 -
Total number of consumers served	+ 0 -
Agency control over consumers served	+ 0 -
Persons served with disabilities	+ 0 -
Persons served with severe disabilities	+ 0 -
Emphasis on serving persons without disabilities	+ 0 -
Choices of services available to clients	+ 0 -
Attention to consumer concerns	+ 0 -
Qualifications of direct service staff	+ 0 -
Proportion of staff who are part-time	+ 0 -
Staff-to-consumer ratio	+ 0 -
Staff turnover	+ 0 -
Dollars spent per customer	+ 0 -
Cost to provide services	+ 0 -
Administrative costs	+ 0 -
Agency's overhead costs	+ 0 -

If "yes", which programs or services for persons with disabilities .....

Have been reduced since 1994?

Have been discontinued?

Expect to reduce or discontinue before 1999?

Have been started as new?

What other changes or impacts have you noted due to changes in funding?

Appendix B

Organizational Profile
Second Survey

Organizational Profile

Instructions. Please complete this profile on your total organization. The *Profile* may be completed from annual reports, outcome studies, and related documents. Items ask for ratings of goals, counts of persons served, income and expenditures, and estimates of changes in funding or in impact of funding changes on your operations. Specific instructions are included for each section. The coded mailing label below will only be used to eliminate unnecessary follow-up of responding organizations.

RETURN BY
Jan. 16, 1998

Person Completing Organizational Survey:

Name

Phone

Year Organization Established

Vocational Rehabilitation Programs Provided by Organization. Please enter the number of consumers in each of the following programs provided by your organization. See "definitions for service programs to be profiled" included with this survey.

	Number of Consumers in Each Program
Evaluation and Assessment	
Job Skills and Work Adjustment Training	
Transitional Employment	
Supported Employment	
Competitive Placement	
Employment Services	

Other Supportive and Non-Vocational Programs. Please identify other consumer service programs (e.g., Adult Day Services) the organization provides that are important resources to persons with disabilities and their families and/or represent revenue generating sources.

Goals of Organization. Please rate importance of each goal to your organization: 4=Core goal for organization, 3=Among most important goals, 2=Important goal for some programs, 1=Unimportant, 0=Not your goal.

Goals	Rated Importance
Provide medical and restorative services	0 1 2 3 4
Provide specific vocational rehabilitation services	0 1 2 3 4
Provide employment for persons with disabilities	0 1 2 3 4
Provide vocational services to persons within community	0 1 2 3 4
Provide educational programs or services	0 1 2 3 4
Provide job skills training	0 1 2 3 4
Provide independent living services	0 1 2 3 4
Provide housing or residential services	0 1 2 3 4
Provide long-term employment	0 1 2 3 4
Provide transitional employment	0 1 2 3 4
Provide work-ready employees to businesses	0 1 2 3 4
Improve quality of life of person with disabilities	0 1 2 3 4
Enable consumers to achieve their vocational goals	0 1 2 3 4
Enable consumers to achieve competitive employment	0 1 2 3 4
Serve as advocate for disabled in community	0 1 2 3 4
Serve needs of community's employers	0 1 2 3 4
Serve needs of people with economic disadvantages	0 1 2 3 4
Serve as an employer in community	0 1 2 3 4
Other (please specify)	0 1 2 3 4

Research and Training Center on Community-Based Rehabilitation Programs, Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute, University of Wisconsin-Stout, 214 10th Avenue, Menomonie, WI 54751

Consumer Outcomes. Please estimate the proportion of consumers who achieved the following outcomes in 1996 and 1999 (estimated) using the following scale: 0=Not an outcome, 1=For 1 to 15% of consumers, 2=15 to 40%, 3=40 to 60%, 4=60 to 85%, 5=85 to 100% of consumers.

Outcomes (Individuals can achieve multiple outcomes)	**Percent for 1996**	**Estimated Percent 1999**
Competitive, integrated employment	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
Competitive, non-integrated setting	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
Facility-based, integrated employment	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
Supported employment	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
Sheltered employment	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
Live independently in community	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
Earnings sufficient to be self-supporting	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
Maintenance (e.g., declining health status)	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
Referred to another rehabilitation program	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
Other (please specify)	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5

Counts of Consumers Served (all service programs) and Their Characteristics. Please provide *total counts* for your 1996 operating year. Then report the *numbers of consumers served annually* according to selected populations and demographic characteristics. For 1999, please indicate if the number of persons serviced are expected to increase (+), not change (0), or decrease (-).

Unduplicated Total Numbers Served	1996	1999
Annual totals		+ 0 -
Average daily counts		+ 0 -
New clients by year		+ 0 -

Designated Service Populations (Individuals may fit more than one category)	1996	1999
Individuals with disabilities		+ 0 -
Individuals with severe disabilities		+ 0 -
Individuals with multiple disabilities		+ 0 -
Welfare recipients		+ 0 -
Displaced workers		+ 0 -
Long-term unemployed		+ 0 -
Immigrants		+ 0 -
School-to-work transition (youth)		+ 0 -
Previously institutionalized		+ 0 -
Public offenders		+ 0 -
Substance abuse		+ 0 -

Specific Demographic Populations	1996	1999
Minority backgrounds		+ 0 -
Females		+ 0 -
Infants and children		+ 0 -
Families		+ 0 -
Youth (under age 18)		+ 0 -
Working age (18 to 65 years)		+ 0 -
Senior citizens (65+ years)		+ 0 -
From inner-city settings/locations		+ 0 -
From rural communities/settings		+ 0 -

RETURN BY JANUARY 16, 1998

Revenue and Expenses. Please report major revenue sources for 1996 in 1000's of dollars. For 1999, please indicate if these revenues are expected to increase (+), not change (0), or decrease (-).

	Dollars in 1000s	
Revenues	**1996**	**1999**
Total Revenue (all sources)		+ 0 -
Public fees for client services (e.g., state, county, local, federal)		+ 0 -
Other sources of fees for client services (e.g., consumer vouchers, insurance)		+ 0 -
Income from set-aside operations (e.g., NISH, JWOD, state-use)		+ 0 -
Income from other business activities (e.g., subcontracts, manufacturing)		+ 0 -
Income from private grants, contributions, investments, gifts, endowments		+ 0 -
All other income (e.g., capital campaigns)		+ 0 -
Expenditures	**1996**	**1999**
Total Expenditures (all sources)		+ 0 -
Administrative operations		+ 0 -
Salaries and Wages		
Management		+ 0 -
Direct service staff		+ 0 -
Client-consumer wages		+ 0 -
Physical plant		+ 0 -
	1996	**1999**
Ratio of Assets to Liabilities	•	•

Sources and Anticipated Changes in Fees and Income. Please estimate percents of the organization's total revenue coming from selected funding and business income sources for 1996. For 1999, circle the appropriate symbol to indicate whether you expect each source to increase in importance (+), not change (0), or decrease in importance (-).

Revenue Sources	**Percent of Total Revenue**	**Anticipated Change in Importance**
Fees From Public Services	**1996**	**1999**
State-level programs		+ 0 -
County-local programs		+ 0 -
Fees From Specific Programs	**1996**	**1999**
Vocational rehabilitation		+ 0 -
Mental health		+ 0 -
Developmental disabilities		+ 0 -
Family services		+ 0 -
Welfare		+ 0 -
Social services		+ 0 -
Health services		+ 0 -
School district, education		+ 0 -
Community support programs		+ 0 -
Department of Labor		+ 0 -
Veterans Administration		+ 0 -
United Way		+ 0 -
Social Security		+ 0 -
Worker Compensation		+ 0 -
Private insurance		+ 0 -

Other Sources for Fees	1996	1999
Individuals and families		+ 0 -
Consumer controlled (e.g., vouchers)		+ 0 -
Other private sources		+ 0 -
Business Activity Income	**1996**	**1999**
Prime manufacturing		+ 0 -
Service contracts		+ 0 -
Subcontracting to business		+ 0 -
Subcontracting to government		+ 0 -
Residential, property management		+ 0 -
Other business activity (please specify)		+ 0 -

Proportion of service program costs covered through fees paid for services.
In 1996 % Anticipate in 1999 %

If coverage is less than 100%, what sources were used to recover or cover costs?

Estimated Overhead. As a percent of your organization's total operating expenses, what is your estimated overhead expenses? %

Impact of Changes in Funding. Has your organization detected significant impacts as a result of changes or shifts in funding of services since 1996?

Yes No

If "Yes", in the next section please estimate how changes in funding have impacted by circling the appropriate symbol using the following scale: Increases (+), no noticeable impact (0), or decreased (-).

Possible Areas Impacted	Rated Impact
Variety of services offered	+ 0 -
Vocational services available	+ 0 -
Number of service programs	+ 0 -
Quality of service programs	+ 0 -
Quality of outcomes achieved by consumers	+ 0 -
Total number of consumers served	+ 0 -
Agency control over consumers served	+ 0 -
Persons served with disabilities	+ 0 -
Persons served with severe disabilities	+ 0 -
Emphasis on serving persons without disabilities	+ 0 -
Choices of services available to clients	+ 0 -
Attention to consumer concerns	+ 0 -
Qualifications of direct service staff	+ 0 -
Proportion of staff who are part-time	+ 0 -
Staff-to-consumer ratio	+ 0 -
Staff turnover	+ 0 -
Dollars spent per customer	+ 0 -
Cost to provide services	+ 0 -
Administrative costs	+ 0 -
Agency's overhead costs	+ 0 -

If "yes", which programs or services for persons with disabilities .....

Have been reduced since 1996?

Have been discontinued?

Expect to reduce or discontinue before 1999?

Have been started as new?

What other changes or impacts have you noted due to changes in funding?

RETURN BY JANUARY 16, 1998